

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully submits that the Attorney Docket No. for the pending application has changed from 06744-0003 to 08806.0010. Please update any records accordingly.

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Cunningham for allowing Applicant's representatives to discuss the pending claims during a telephonic interview on August 24, 2004. The substance of the interview, as characterized by the Examiner in the Interview Summary Record, is summarized as follows: "[r]ecommended applicant to better define continuous zooming over Martin's 'further magnified' (continuous zooming). Also in claim 20, make clear what is simultaneously occurring: zooming and enablement or zooming and downloading."

By the above amendment, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 20 to clarify and more appropriately define the claimed invention and claims 3, 6-8, 12-13, 21-23, and 26 to eliminate some typographical errors. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and §103(a) but objected to claims 15 and 19. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter in claims 15 and 19. Based on the following arguments, however Applicant respectfully traverses those rejections and requests allowance of the present application.

I. The Rejection of Claims 1, 4-8, 10, 20, 21, 23, and 27-32 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or In The Alternative, Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) As Obvious Over Battat et al.

Claims 1, 4-8, 10, 20, 21, 23, and 27-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Martin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,147,709) or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Battat et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0033402 A1). Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1, 4-8, 10, 20, 21, 23, and 27-32 because Martin et al. and Battat et al. fail to teach or suggest each and every recitation of these claims.

Claim 1 recites “[a] method for zooming in an image that is being presented on a display device connected to a storage unit, wherein said presentation image is loaded to the display device from said storage unit and said presentation image comprises at least one preselected, zoomable area, said method comprising the steps of”, *inter alia*, “from the start of the step of continuous zooming, simultaneously downloading a detail image information data set from the storage unit, wherein said detail image information data set is used for presenting the preselected area in higher resolution than in the presentation image.” Martin et al. fails to teach or suggest simultaneously downloading consistent with the present invention. Although Martin et al. inserts a high resolution image into an interactive lower resolution image after a predetermined level of magnification is reached, Martin et al. does not teach or suggest the step of “from the start of the step of continuous zooming, simultaneously downloading a detail image information data set from the storage unit, wherein said detail image information data set is used for presenting the preselected area in higher resolution than in the presentation image,” as recited in claim 1. Rather, Martin et al. is concerned with the

sequence of replacing a lower resolution image with a high resolution image after a magnification level is selected . See Martin et al., column 2, lines 36-67. Therefore, Martin et al. fails to disclose “from the start of the step of continuous zooming, simultaneously downloading a detail image information data set from the storage unit, wherein said detail image information data set is used for presenting the preselected area in higher resolution than in the presentation image“ as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Martin et al. inserts a high resolution image into an interactive lower resolution image only after a predetermined level of magnification is reached. See Martin et al., column 2, lines 36-67. Therefore, Martin et al. also fails to disclose “from the start of the step of continuous zooming, simultaneously downloading a detail image information data set from the storage unit, wherein said detail image information data set is used for presenting the preselected area in higher resolution than in the presentation image.“

For at least these reasons, Martin et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every recitation of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Battat et al.¹ does not make up for the deficiencies of Martin et al. Battat et al. fails to teach or suggest the step of “from the start of the step of continuous zooming, simultaneously downloading a detail image information data set from the storage unit, wherein said detail image information data set is used for presenting the preselected

¹ The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-8, 10, 20, 21, 23, and 27-32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Martin et al or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Battat et al. Applicant assumes that the Examiner meant the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be Martin et al. in view of Battat et al.

area in higher resolution than in the presentation image” as recited in claim 1. Indeed, the Examiner merely used Battat et al. to show the steps of continuous zooming while displaying higher detail, but makes no attempt to show where the reference teaches or suggests the step of “from the start of the step of continuous zooming, simultaneously downloading a detail image information data set from the storage unit, wherein said detail image information data set is used for presenting the preselected area in higher resolution than in the presentation image” as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is thus allowable over Martin et al. in view of Battat et al..

Moreover, claims 4-8 and 10 depend from claim 1 and thus require all the elements of claim 1. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Martin et al. and Battat et al. fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 4-8 and 10.

Claim 20 recites “[a] a method for generating an image for electronic presentation, comprising the steps of”, *inter alia*, “associating the detail image information data sets with the corresponding areas in the presentation image to enable a download of one detail image information data set simultaneously with the start of continuous zooming in on the corresponding area of the presentation image.” Martin et al. fails to disclose such a download consistent with the present invention. Although Martin et al. inserts a high resolution image into an interactive lower resolution image after a predetermined level of magnification is reached, Martin et al. does not teach or suggest the step of “associating the detail image information data sets with the corresponding areas in the presentation image to enable a download of one detail image information data set simultaneously with the start of continuous zooming in on the corresponding area of the presentation image,” as recited in claim 20. As noted

above, Martin et al. is concerned with the sequence of replacing a lower resolution image with a high resolution image after a magnification level is selected. Therefore, Martin et al. fails to disclose “associating the detail image information data sets with the corresponding areas in the presentation image to enable a download of one detail image information data set simultaneously with the start of continuous zooming in on the corresponding area of the presentation image“ as recited in claim 20.

Furthermore, Martin et al. discloses insertion of a high resolution image into an interactive lower resolution image only after a predetermined level of magnification is reached. See Martin et al., column 2, lines 36-67. Therefore, Martin et al. also fails to disclose “associating the detail image information data sets with the corresponding areas in the presentation image to enable a download of one detail image information data set simultaneously with the start of continuous zooming in on the corresponding area of the presentation image.“

For at least these reasons, Martin et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every recitation of claim 20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Furthermore, Battat et al. does not make up for the deficiencies of Martin et al. Battat et al. fails to teach or suggest the step of “associating the detail image information data sets with the corresponding areas in the presentation image to enable a download of one detail image information data set simultaneously with the start of continuous zooming in on the corresponding area of the presentation image“ as recited in claim 20. Indeed, the Examiner relies on Battat et al. to show the steps of continuous zooming while displaying higher detail but does not show where the reference teaches

or suggests the step of “associating the detail image information data sets with the corresponding areas in the presentation image to enable a download of one detail image information data set simultaneously with the start of continuous zooming in on the corresponding area of the presentation image” as recited in claim 20. Claim 20 is therefore allowable for this reason also.

Claims 21, 23, and 27-32 depend from claim 20 and thus require all the elements of claim 20. As discussed above, Martin et al. and Battat et al. fail to teach or suggest at least the step of “associating the detail image information data sets with the corresponding areas in the presentation image to enable a download of one detail image information data set simultaneously with the start of continuous zooming in on the corresponding area of the presentation image” as recited in claim 20. Therefore, for at least this reason, claims 21, 23, and 27-32 are allowable over the prior art.

II. The Rejection of Claims 2, 3, 6, 9, 11, 22 and 24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 2, 3, 6, 9, 11, 22 and 24 as being unpatentable over Martin et al. or in the alternative Martin et al. and Battat et al. in view of Sivan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,281,874), because the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 9, 11, 22 and 24 depend from claims 1 and 21. As explained above, claims 1 and 21 are distinguishable from Martin et al. and Battat et al. Accordingly, claims 2, 3, 6, 9, 11, 22 and 24 are also distinguishable from these references at least for the same reasons set forth above in respect to claims 1 and 21.

Furthermore, Sivan et al. does not overcome the above described deficiencies of Martin et al. Sivan et al. fails to teach or suggest the steps of “from the start of the step of continuous zooming, simultaneously downloading a detail image information data set from the storage unit, wherein said detail image information data set is used for presenting the preselected area in higher resolution than in the presentation image “ and “associating the detail image information data sets with the corresponding areas in the presentation image to enable a download of one detail image information data set simultaneously with the start of continuous zooming in on the corresponding area of the presentation image” as recited in claims 1 and 20, respectively. Indeed, the Examiner relies on Sivan et al. to show the steps of “wherein the detail image information data set comprises a difference image, said difference image representing the difference between the zoomed-in-on, preselected area in the presentation image and a detail image representing the zoomed in-on, preselected area in higher resolution,” “adding the difference image to the zoomed in-on, preselected area in higher resolution and replacing the zoomed-in-on, preselected area in the presentation image on the display device by the detail image,” and “wherein the detail image fills the window when replacing the zoomed-in-on, preselected area in the presentation image.,” but makes no attempt to show where the reference teaches or suggests the steps of “from the start of the step of continuous zooming, simultaneously downloading a detail image information data set from the storage unit, wherein said detail image information data set is used for presenting the preselected area in higher resolution than in the presentation image “ and “associating the detail image information data sets with the corresponding areas in the presentation image to enable a download of one detail image information data set

simultaneously with the start of continuous zooming in on the corresponding area of the presentation image" as recited in claims 1 and 20.

For these additional reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2, 3, 6, 9, 11, 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

III. The Rejection of Claims 12-14, 16-18, and 25 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 12-14, 16-18, and 25 as unpatentable over Martin et al. and Sivan et al. in view of Battat et al., because the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claims 12-14, 16-18, and 25 depend from claims 1, 2 3, and 20. As explained, claims 1, 2, and 20 are distinguishable from Martin et al. Battat et al., and Sivan et al. Accordingly, claims 2-14, 16-18, and 25 are also distinguishable over these references for at least the same reasons set above in regard to for claims 1, 2, 3, and 20.

IV. The Rejection of Claim 26 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 26 as unpatentable over Martin et al., Sivan et al., and Battat et al., and further in view of McCrossin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,600,840) because the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claim 26 depends from claims 25. As noted above, claim 25 is distinguishable from Martin et al. Battat et al., and Sivan et al. Accordingly, claim 26 is also distinguishable from these references for at least due to its dependence from claim 25.

Moreover, McCrossin et al. does overcome the above described deficiencies of Martin et al., Sivan et al., and Battat et al. McCrossin et al. fails to teach or suggest the step of “associating the detail image information data sets with the corresponding areas in the presentation image to enable a download of one detail image information data set simultaneously with the start of continuous zooming in on the corresponding area of the presentation image” as recited in claim 20. Indeed, the Examiner merely cited McCrossin et al. allegedly for teaching the steps of “rotating the detail images so that they are oriented in the same way as the presentation image” but makes no attempt to show where the reference teaches or suggests the step of “associating the detail image information data sets with the corresponding areas in the presentation image to enable a download of one detail image information data set simultaneously with the start of continuous zooming in on the corresponding area of the presentation image” as recited in claim 20.

For these additional reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of claims 1-32.

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1-32 in condition for allowance. Applicant submits that the proposed amendments to claims 1 and 20 do not raise any new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent

in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully points out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicants' invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicant to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicant submits that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, GARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 2, 2004

By: Milan Kapadia
Milan Kapadia
Reg. No. 55,982